



Task Force on Court Facilities

455 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102-3660

Meeting Report

August 30 & 31, 2000

Fess Parker's Doubletree Resort, Santa Barbara, CA

<p>ATTENDEES:</p> <p>TASK FORCE MEMBERS:</p> <p>PRESENT: Hon. Daniel J. Kremer, Chair Mr. Greg Abel Hon. Joan B. Bechtel Ms. Yvonne Campos Mr. John Clarke Mr. Mike Courtney Hon. Hector De La Torre Sheriff Robert T. Doyle Hon. Jerry Eaves Hon. Gary Freeman Mr. David Janssen Mr. Fred Klass Hon. Michael Nail Hon. Wayne Peterson Hon. Charles V. Smith Mr. Anthony Tyrrell Hon. Diane Elan Wick</p> <p>ABSENT: Mr. Wylie Aitken</p> <p>TASK FORCE STAFF: Mr. Robert Lloyd, Project Director, Facilities Unit Mr. Robert Emerson, Project Manager, Senior Facilities Planner Ms. Patricia Bonderud, AIA, CSI Facilities Planner Mr. Bruce Newman, Facilities Planner</p>	<p>PRESENTERS: Mr. Gary Blair, Superior Court, County of Santa Barbara Mr. Andy Cupples, Daniel, Mann, Johnson & Mendenhall Mr. Tom Gardner, Vitetta Group Hon. Frank Ochoa, Presiding Judge, Superior Court, County of Santa Barbara Mr. Jay Smith, Daniel, Mann, Johnson, & Mendenhall Hon. Brian Van Camp, Chair, Space Mitigation Working Group</p> <p>CONSULTANTS TO THE TASK FORCE: Ms. Kit Cole, Vitetta Group Mr. Simon Park, Daniel, Mann, Johnson, & Mendenhall</p> <p>GUESTS: Mr. John Abbott, County of Orange Ms. Kathy Burns, DSA Mr. Kevin Carruth, County of Santa Clara Mr. Bruce Doenges, Superior Court, County of Ventura Mr. Terry Dryer, County of Ventura Mr. Joseph T. Fallin, Superior Court, County of Los Angeles Ms. Karen Finn, California Department of Finance Mr. Chris Geiger, Legislative Analysts Office Ms. Tina Hansen, Administrative Office of the Courts Mr. Donald Kendig, County of Santa Barbara Ms. Tressa Sloan Kentner, Superior Court, County of San Bernardino Ms. Catherine Knighten, Orange County Mr. Al Lopez, Superior Court, County of Sacramento Ms. Sally Lukenbill, California Department of Finance Mr. Jack Miller, San Diego County Ms. Eraina Ortega, Legislative Analysts Office Ms. Jody Patel, Administrative Office of the Courts Mr. Garry Raley, Superior Court, County of Riverside Mr. Robert Sherman, Superior Court, County of Ventura Mr. Dan Smith, DSA Mr. Ron Taylor, OMNI Group, Inc. Mr. Joshua Weinstein, Administrative Office of the Courts Mr. John Van Whervin, Superior Court, County of Los Angeles Mr. Jonathan Wolin, Administrative Office of the Courts Mr. Tom Womack, GSA, County of Ventura</p>
---	--

I. OPENING REMARKS – Justice Daniel Kremer

- 1) Justice Kremer opened the Task force meeting at 10:08 a.m. and reviewed the meeting objectives and agenda.
- 2) Justice Kremer proposed formation of a writing working group to assist in the preparation of the 2nd Interim Report. The proposal was approved and a sign-up sheet circulated.
- 3) The Task force reviewed and unanimously approved the meeting report from the May 31, 2000 meeting in Redding (Meeting #11).
- 4) The task force unanimously approved the text changes to the Preliminary Determination: Trial Court Facilities Guidelines and to the Preliminary Determination: Facility Guidelines for Technology in the Courthouse.

II. SPACE MITIGATION WORKING GROUP – Judge Brian Van Camp

- 1) Judge Van Camp, chair of the Space Mitigation Working Group, thanked working group members for their efforts. He reminded the task force members that the mission of the working group is to recommend operational changes that may mitigate the need for additional court facilities, including methods to more fully utilize existing facilities. Judge Van Camp noted that the group looked at measures that reduced the amount of space needed for court facilities and not, necessarily, measures improving court operations or efficiency. Judge Van Camp referred the task force to the draft report prepared by the Space Mitigation Working Group. Judge Van Camp reviewed each item in the Summary of Recommended Options.

- 2) Comments on the draft report:

- a) Item I.A.1 Video Conferencing for Arraignments and other Pre-Trial Criminal Proceedings.

Mr. Clarke asked why savings in criminal courts are included, but not in civil courts? Judge Van Camp responded that the working group would review and consider including civil courts.

- b) II.A Courtroom Utilization

Judge Van Camp cited examples of judges sharing courtrooms and using clustered chambers. Butte County's practice of assigning courtrooms with cases was cited as well as the successful sharing of courtrooms on the east-coast and in Canada. Judge Petersen said that he visited Ottawa, Canada and observed courts that share courtrooms. He noted that increased courtroom utilization was achievable with systemic changes that limited a defendant's right to a jury trial and attorneys' preemptory challenges, as is the case in Canada. For shared courtrooms to work in California there would have to be a cultural mind-shift as well as specific changes to current law. He also noted that at any given time approximately 10% of the judges in San Diego were absent due to a variety of reasons.

- c) II.C. Regionalization of Court Facilities

Mr. Clarke complimented the working group on the report and noted that this change could result in significant savings.

- 3) Justice Kremer explained that the Space Mitigation Working Group report is planned to be an appendix in the task force's final report. He noted that some of the group's recommendations already appear in the Guidelines, for example the option to cluster chambers. Justice Kremer requested that AOC staff and consultants quantify the savings

that might accrue by implementing the recommendations of the Space Mitigation Working Group and report back to the task force.

III. PHASE 4 – FACILITIES EVALUATION PROGRESS REPORT - Mr. Jay Smith & Mr. Andy Cupples

- 1) Mr. Jay Smith outlined the agenda for the Phase 4 discussion as follows:
 - a) Status of surveys and planning options.
 - b) Schedule for remaining counties.
 - c) Schedule for the task force report.
 - d) Review and discussion of the Phase 4 report.
- 2) Mr. Jay Smith distributed a table and summary that showed progress to date as follows:
 - a) County court facilities surveys are 100% complete.
 - b) Appellate court surveys are 50% complete.
 - c) County planning options will be complete by August 31 with the exception of Los Angeles and San Mateo.
 - d) Remaining counties will be completed by October 15.
- 3) Mr. Jay Smith also distributed a schedule showing upcoming work and milestones for the database, evaluations, county reports, Phase 4 & 5 reports, 2nd Interim Report, and task force meetings (including proposed writing workshops). Mr. Smith noted that presentations of the reports will be made to 21 counties, which represent 90% of the court facilities in the state. Mr. Smith indicated that the consultants will review the evaluations with other counties in a telephone conference. Mr. Lloyd interjected that meetings could be scheduled for smaller counties if warranted by the complexity or sensitivity of planning recommendations.

Mr. Cupples reviewed the Phase 4 Report working document. He noted that the overall report length was expected to be 100 pages and that layout issues are not all resolved. He explained that the general tone should be positive and factual.

- 4) Task force members made the following comments regarding the Phase 4 work:
 - a) Supervisor Smith inquired if the consultants had received comments back from counties. Mr. Jay Smith replied that comments are being received and that their substance will be incorporated into the phase 4 report. He also noted that in January a public review process starts, so counties would have a second chance to comment.
 - b) Mr. Janssen asked if the 20-year planning horizon discussed in the executive summary was correct. Mr. Cupples replied that court facilities needs are projected to 2020 and that planning options were developed based upon this 20-year projection. Mr. Cupples also noted that future need and current need are separately identified. Justice Kremer confirmed that the task force had approved a 20-year planning horizon noting that Justice Planning Associates used it in their space forecasts.
 - c) Justice Kremer suggested that carefully selected illustrative examples, both positive and negative, could be useful in the discussion presented in Section 2: Inventory.
 - d) Mr. Cupples solicited the task force's opinion on whether Table 2.3 should isolate facilities that are 80 to 100% occupied by the courts. Judge Wick said that buildings that are exclusively used for the courts (100% courts' use) should be identified separately and that the table should include a column showing this information since it will aid in identifying single purpose court buildings during the transfer process. Mr. Cupples noted that most large facilities are shared between court and other county agencies and that smaller court facilities are often dedicated exclusively to the courts. He reminded task force members that non-court agencies (e.g. District Attorney, Public Defender, and Probation) located in court facilities and the area they occupy is included in the database but their space was not evaluated. Noting that the evaluation process focused on court space, Supervisor Freeman inquired if costs for

relocating non-court functions were included in estimating planning options where appropriate. Mr. Cupples said that those costs were included.

- 5) Mr. Cupples discussed Table 3.1 that identifies potential seismic issues. He stated that the evaluations are simple and are based on age and type of building rather than engineering surveys or detailed structural analysis. The purpose is to identify costs, not specific seismic deficiencies that need to be corrected. Justice Kremer noted the need to explain the table clearly with proper annotations to ensure that the information presented is fully understood by any reader.
- 6) Mr. Klass asked if the consultants had computed the cost impact of changing the threshold for a marginal functional rating from 60% to 70%. Mr. Cupples noted that the change was for the spatial rating and not the functional rating. He stated that the computation has not been done but expected it to have little impact on cost since a marginal or adequate functional rating would always override a deficient spatial rating. Mr. Klass noted that this could be important and emphasized that the evaluation should be done. Mr. Cupples indicated that the consultants would run the requested test.
- 7) Justice Kremer cautioned against leaving Table 3.12 that shows space shortfalls based solely on the computer model in the final report. The computer generated space shortfall is only a step in the process and does not accurately represent the final planning options and cost estimates developed by the task force.
- 8) It was asked if the goal is for the state to own most court facilities or continue a mix of owned and leased facilities. Mr. Courtney stated that he did not think the task force was advocating total state ownership of court facilities but rather total state responsibility that can be achieved through a combination of fee-simple ownership and leases with either counties or private owners. Mr. Abel cautioned that the task force does not need to recommend a strict policy of state fee-simple ownership.
- 9) Mr. Cupples noted that planning options typically recommend that deficient buildings be abandoned but do not propose specific time frames for effecting the recommendations. Mr. Lloyd noted that every county needs a five-year court facility master plan to guide these decisions.
- 10) Mr. Klass asked that the report clearly state that cost estimates reflect a twenty-year need and are not the task force's recommendation for current year spending.
- 11) Justice Kremer concluded the discussion with a reminder that policy and political decisions will be based upon the task force's report. He noted that the overall cost estimates appear to be in line.

IV. SANTA BARBARA COURT PRESENTATION – Presiding Judge Frank Ochoa and Mr. Gary Blair

- 1) Santa Barbara County has a population of approximately 400,000. There are nineteen judges and five commissioners serving the county. Eight court facilities are currently in use. They range from the historic courthouse in downtown Santa Barbara to a modern facility built in the early 1990s in Santa Maria. Because of the rapid growth in the northern part of the county clerks are now housed in trailers at the Santa Maria Courthouse. In addition, there is a significant juror parking problem downtown. Currently the North County accounts for approximately 60 to 65% of Santa Barbara's juvenile caseload. The Board of Supervisors is currently considering projects for a juvenile courtroom in Santa Maria as well as improved clerks' facilities. A concern that liabilities transfer along with facilities was raised regarding these projects. Judge Ochoa also

noted that the historic courthouse in downtown Santa Barbara is a major tourist attraction that creates security issues.

V. PHASE 5 FINANCE COMMITTEE REPORT – Mr. Jay Smith and Mr. Tom Gardner

- 1) Mr. Smith and Mr. Gardner reviewed:
 - a) AB 233 requirements and their relationship to the Finance and Implementation Committee's work,
 - b) The Task Force on Court Facilities' work plan and its relation to the work of the Finance and Implementation Committee,
 - c) Consensus issues approved by the task force at its meeting in Redding,
 - d) Issues on which the committee has reached consensus but which the task force must review, and approve,
 - e) Proposed principles for negotiations involving mixed-use buildings that require task force review and approval.
 - f) Proposed table of contents for the phase 5 report.
- 2) Task force members had the following comments:
 - a) General Discussion:
 - (1) Mr. Clarke asked if the transfer of pending lawsuits and claims related to existing court facilities was discussed by the committee. Mr. Gardner indicated that they had not been discussed but will be.
 - (2) Judge Petersen sees no motivation for counties to spend dollars on court facilities between now and the time the state takes over court facilities (if it does). He feels the courts are stuck in the middle between the counties and the state until it is resolved who will be responsible for court facilities. Mr. Janssen noted that this problem might be addressable in legislation the task force proposes for enacting its recommendations. Judge Petersen thinks that such legislation would have to provide state money for court construction during the transfer process not just mandate that the counties provide needed facilities. He noted that courts basically have the right to compel the counties to build facilities now but it is, in fact, rarely used because it results in litigation that inevitably delays projects. Judge Peterson stated that in his opinion the interim financing issue is the most important one for the task force to address.
 - (3) Supervisor Eaves noted that San Bernardino County did not accept the proposed court master plan because of uncertainty concerning the county's future responsibility for court facilities. Mr. Abel said that many counties will do as little as possible until a decision is made.
 - (4) Mr. Janssen emphasized that the period of uncertainty should be as short as possible or the transfer will cause tremendous problems for both the courts and the counties.
 - (5) Justice Kremer suggested including a date in the task force's report by which their recommendations should either be adopted or dropped as was done by the Task Force on Court Employees.
 - b) Fiscal Neutrality
 - (1) There was a general discussion that principle #7, which states that revenue generated by Courthouse Construction fees will transfer from the counties to the state, is related to principle#1, which indicates that responsibility for debt shall stay with the counties either directly or by transfer of the revenue stream and debt to the state. The discussion lead to the conclusion that courthouse construction fees would transfer to the state unless the revenue was committed to debt service. In that case the governmental entity responsible for retiring the debt would get the money. Principle #7 needs to be rewritten to clearly reflect this.
 - (2) Mr. Jay Smith stated that it is intended that county funds used for paying commercial leases transfer to the state. Mr. Gardner said that the calculation of

the proposed Maintenance of Effort (MOE) agreement would include county lease expenses. Mr. Lloyd asked that this be clarified in the proposed language.

c) Principles of Transfer

- (1) Judge Petersen asked if funding for staff to implement the proposed transfer is addressed. Mr. Gardner responded that it would be addressed in the phase 5 report.
- (2) Mr. Clarke asked whether sheriffs and district attorneys would support the transfer of mixed use buildings to the state. Mr. Janssen thought so since the state would pay for relocating them if relocation was required.
- (3) Mr. Gardner stated that the committee is still working to define the criteria upon which the state could refuse to accept responsibility for a building. He noted that the committee members agreed that the burden of proof for rejecting a building is the state's and that the state Public Works Board should be responsible for resolving disputes.
- (4) Regarding principle #7, which addresses the disposition of historic buildings, Mr. Lloyd stated that the county should not have the unilateral right to evict the courts from historic courthouses. The consultants agreed to review and revise the language to address this concern.

d) Implementation

- (1) Mr. Klass expressed concern that the state does not currently have the staff necessary to carry out a task force recommendation to transfer responsibilities for court facilities to the state.
- (2) It was asked if counties with urgent facility needs should transfer early in the process and whether that should be specifically stated as a task force goal. Mr. Lloyd stated that counties with critical facilities needs or delayed projects could be identified easily. This information can be used in developing the transfer negotiation schedule.
- (3) Principle # 12 addresses the Courthouse Construction Fund and recommends that 75% of the fees collected locally be transferred to the state for reallocation to the courts. The principle proposes that local courts retain 25% of the fees for small projects.

Mr. Klass noted that the state does not have any other system that works in this way. Generally, state funding is based upon demonstrated need with money coming from the general fund or public bonds.

Mr. Abel strongly advocated having a small local fund for addressing minor facility needs expeditiously. He expressed concern that the state facility funding process will not be responsive to local court needs. He noted that the local courts are managing their operating budgets and their employees and are capable of managing minor facilities projects.

Judge Petersen emphasized that judges are elected locally and answer to their constituents. As such, they should be able to address small local facilities needs that serve the interests of their constituents without going through the state funding process.

Justice Kremer asked for a vote on the concept of leaving a portion of the Courthouse Construction Fund with the local court but not the specific sharing formula. Mr. Abel made the motion, which was seconded. The task force voted to recommend that a percentage of the money collected in the Courthouse Construction Funds be left with the local court for minor facilities projects.

- (4) Regarding principles #10 and #11, which address disposal of court facilities by the state, Mr. Courtney noted that the legislature must approve the state's disposal of property.

- e) Principles for Negotiation Involving Mixed-Use Buildings
 - (1) Regarding principle #5, which addresses forced displacement from a mixed-use building, Mr. Klass and Mr. Janssen questioned whether the current language correctly reflects the previous discussion and decisions of the task force. The language should reflect that if two-thirds of a building is held by one party then that party's decision holds, but compensation must be made to the minority tenant.
 - (2) Judge Petersen suggested that the courts be able to move other tenants regardless of whether they want to go and that this should be in every MOU, so it doesn't become a future roadblock. Mr. Klass stated that he did not think the task force should take that position.
 - (3) Mr. Janssen noted that typically it is the courts that expand and take over district attorney and public defender space, not vice-versa.
 - (4) Judge Petersen questioned whether the court should pay to relocate the district attorney's offices when they typically expected to move at some point anyway.

VI. TOUR OF SANTA BARBARA COURTHOUSE

- 1) Mr. Gary Blair arranged for the task force to tour the historic courthouse in downtown Santa Barbara. Ms. Annette Carol, a docent for the court's historical society, led the tour that emphasized the historic aspects for the courthouse but not its functional attributes.

VII. REVIEW OF DRAFT 2ND INTERIM REPORT – Mr. Jay Smith and Mr. Andy Cupples

- 1) Mr. Jay Smith stated that the Second Interim Report should be written as a report to the Governor, Legislature and Judicial Council. It should highlight the task force's work while summarizing the findings in each of the four work phases: facility guidelines; space forecasts; inventory, evaluation and capital planning; and governmental responsibility, finance, and implementation.
- 2) Mr. Jay Smith suggested that the report be organized as a "pyramid" with the executive summary at the apex supported in order by the Second Interim Report, project phase reports, and county evaluation/planning reports. The report should contain a concise executive overview and summary of findings that is organized in direct response to the task forces duties prescribed in the enabling legislation. The main volume would be comprised of the task forces essential findings and recommendation and would be supported by the much larger individual phase reports.
- 3) Mr. Jay Smith presented the following proposed report outline:
 - a) Executive Summary
 - (1) Preamble from task force charge
 - (2) Task force statement
 - (3) Summary of findings from legislation for each of the nine document requirements in legislation
 - b) Introduction
 - (1) Task force statement of charge and role
 - (2) Organization of task force, committees, and working groups
 - (3) Process and approach - phases of the study
 - (4) Organization of the report

- c) Facility Guidelines (Trial Courts, Appellate Courts, and Technology Guidelines)
 - (1) Authority and purpose
 - (2) Development process and intended use
 - (3) Scope and organization of guidelines
 - (4) Summary of key components
 - (5) Where to find the complete guidelines
 - d) Projected Growth
 - (1) Purpose related to legislative charge
 - (2) Method and analysis of historic trends
 - (3) Issues that would mitigate future needs
 - (4) Use of projections
 - (5) Summary of projections
 - (6) Overview of supporting documentation
 - e) Statewide Facilities Assessment
 - (1) Overview of process
 - (2) Bulleted summary of key findings in terms of:
 - (a) Inventory - what we have now
 - (b) Evaluation - current condition
 - (c) Current capital needs
 - (d) Future capital needs
 - (3) Phasing of capital improvements
 - f) Implementation and Funding
 - (1) Basis for recommending state responsibility
 - (2) Principles for transfer of fiscal responsibility
 - (3) Recommended organizational model
 - (4) Overview of transition/implementation plan
 - g) Appendices
- 4) Mr. Smith further outlined the executive summary as follows:
- a) Introduction - Statement of Task Force
 - b) The state of existing court facilities
 - (1) Overview of survey and evaluation process
 - (2) Facility guidelines
 - (3) Key Findings (inventory facts, distribution of mixed-use, lease vs. owned, functional, physical, courtroom evaluation, and space shortfalls).
 - c) The need for new or modified facilities
 - (1) Summary of factors driving need to modify or replace facilities (security, condition, consolidation, utilization)
 - (2) Approach to options development
 - (3) Summary of current needs
 - (4) Range of costs (renovation, addition, replacement)
 - d) The currently available funding options for constructing or renovating court facilities
 - (1) Construction funding sources (court fees, courthouse construction funds, general funds)
 - (2) Maintenance and operations (maintenance of effort, use of courthouse construction funds for allowable costs)
 - e) The impact which creating additional judgeships has upon court facility and other justice system (facility) needs
 - (1) Additional judgeships -
 - (a) Overview of projection methodology, approach, purpose, impacts of external factors
 - (b) Summary of statewide judgeships and staff projections
 - (c) Summary of statewide need in terms of courtrooms, area, and dollars
 - (2) Other justice system facility needs
 - (a) Restate impacts of external factors

- (b) Impact on court related agencies (DA, Defender, Probation, Family Court Services)
 - (c) Provision for replacement of space for agencies displaced by courts
 - (d) Impact on detention and law enforcement
 - (3) Court facilities - information from Unification Working Group's report and extent to which the recommendations are reflected in the planning options
 - f) Administrative and operational changes which can reduce or mitigate the need for added court or justice system facilities
 - (1) Incorporate information from Mitigation Working Group's report (brief introduction and bulleted summary of key changes, e.g., regionalization, move traffic to administrative law)
 - g) Recommendations for specific funding responsibilities among governmental entities, including full state responsibility, full county responsibility, or shared responsibility.
 - (1) Overview of Phase 5 analysis
 - (2) Summary of task force findings and recommendations
 - (a) Rationale for state responsibility
 - (b) Statement of principles of facility responsibility and fiscal neutrality
 - h) Proposed transition plan if responsibility is to be changed.
 - (1) Statement of principles for transfer and implementation issues as basis for negotiations with counties
 - (2) Timeline for transition
 - (3) Organizational models for on-going capital asset management organization and transition organization
 - (4) Funding requirements (organizational, transition, capital, and O&M)
 - (5) Legislative framework and timeline
 - i) Recommendations regarding funding sources for court facilities and funding mechanisms to support court facilities.
 - (1) Summary of current funding mechanisms (trial court funding, court fees, and how they transfer to state)
 - (2) Summary statement of fiscal neutrality principles including:
 - (a) County responsibility for debt service
 - (b) County responsibility for lease costs
 - (c) MOE for operations and maintenance funds
 - (d) Identification of new revenue sources for capital and operations and maintenance costs
- 5) Discussion:
- a) Mr. Janssen noted that the executive summary needed to be under 10 pages; five pages would be best. He emphasized that it must be clear and concise. He also suggested that there be a separate page highlighting the need for prompt action regarding the task force's recommendations. He noted that joint hearings should be planned before the Senate and Assembly Judiciary Committees in about February.
 - b) Mr. Abel suggested that the executive summary include a history of trial court funding back to 1987. It should discuss the Task Force on Court Employees and the legislation that is pending to implement its recommendations.
 - c) Mr. Janssen feels that the executive summary, as proposed, will be confusing since it is organized around the task force's legislative charge and does not reflect the organization of the report itself. After general discussion, Justice Kremer suggested that the title be changed to "Response to Legislative Charge."

VII. REVIEW OF LAND AND PARKING COSTS – Mr. Jay Smith

- 1) Mr. Jay Smith noted that the public expects to pay for parking in downtown urban areas. Parking can generate revenue and the substantial costs of providing parking may not need to be funded by the project. Parking requirements may be met by other parking facilities in the area. Mr. Smith suggested that court projects may need to address only a portion of parking needs (such as 50%) as part of the project. In addition, public transportation may also reduce the need for parking in urban areas. Courts could pay public transportation and parking fees for jurors. Mr. Smith noted that need varies with location. For renovation of an existing building, the existing limited parking may be considered adequate whereas for a new building on a new site parking may need to be fully addressed. Mr. Smith then presented a proposed methodology for incorporating land and parking costs into the task force's estimate of capital facility needs.
- 2) Proposed methodology:
 - a) Basic assumptions:
 - (1) Project sites range from urban to suburban in the largest 21 counties.
 - (2) Higher land costs in urban core projects often require parking structures.
 - (3) Project physical planning in response to site tends to mitigate higher land cost.
 - (4) As land cost gets higher, the height and density of buildings and parking structures will increase to mitigate the impact of land cost.
 - (5) In many urban areas, the public expects to pay for parking, and parking revenues can fund revenue bonds.
 - b) Assumed land costs:
 - (1) Largest most urban 8 counties: \$51/sf to \$103/sf
 - (2) Next most urban 13 counties: \$26/sf to \$51/sf
 - (3) Remaining 37 counties (9% of space): \$13/sf to \$26/sf
 - c) Key parameters of parking cost:
 - (1) Parking spaces required per courtroom: 45
 - (2) Gross area per courtroom: 10,700 S.F.
 - (3) Total construction cost per courtroom: \$1,947,400
 - (4) Area per parking space: 350 S.F.
 - (5) Parking structure cost per space: \$20,800
 - (6) On-grade parking site development cost per site square foot: \$17
 - d) Parking facility assumptions:
 - (1) In largest 8 most urban counties
 - (a) 80% of projects will require parking structures
 - (b) Provide 50% of parking demand within project budget
 - (2) In next 13 most urban counties
 - (a) 50% of projects will require parking structures
 - (b) Provide 75% of parking demand within project budget
 - (3) In the balance of projects for all other counties
 - (a) Provide on-grade parking satisfying 100% of the parking demand within the project budgets
 - e) Recommended allowance for land and parking cost (as a % of construction cost)
 - (1) Most urban 8 counties (70% of court space)
 - (a) Parking: 21%
 - (b) Land: 28%
 - (2) Next most urban 13 counties (21% of court space)
 - (a) Parking: 21%
 - (b) Land: 26%
 - (3) Balance of counties (9% of court space)
 - (a) Parking: 16%
 - (b) Land: 20%
- 3) Discussion:

- a) Mr. De La Torre noted that his city, Southgate, is located in an urban area but that court users are accustomed to free parking. Based on this he felt that the generalization that people in downtown urban areas are accustomed to paying for parking may not be true.
- b) The criteria of 45 parking spaces per courtroom was discussed along with the option of reducing this by 50% because not everyone may need a parking space if public transportation and alternate parking facilities are considered.
- c) Mr. Clarke felt the 50% criteria results in too few parking spaces. He noted that LA typically uses 45 spaces. Mr. Jay Smith noted that DMJM typically uses 45 spaces per courtroom when designing to meet full-parking demand.
- d) Mr. Clarke noted that 60% of LA court business occurs downtown.
- e) Mr. Klass and Mr. Courtney suggested that decisions regarding funding of parking and land should be made later. Identification of the revenue stream is not important right now. The task force should focus on the amount of demand it recommends be supplied.
- f) Mr. Miller noted that the cost of subterranean parking structures increases with every level you go down and suggested that above-ground parking structures are typically more economical.
- g) Mr. Courtney noted that DGS typically uses 350 S.F. per parking space for estimating.
- h) Mr. Klass asked DMJM to calculate costs of meeting 100% parking and then cost options showing the effect of reducing the percentage of parking demand that is met.

IX. CLOSING REMARKS – Justice Daniel Kremer

- 1) Justice Kremer announced the members of the Writing Working Group:
 - Mr. Greg Abel, Chair
 - Mr. John A. Clarke
 - Hon. Daniel J. Kremer
 - Mr. Rubin Lopez (CSAC)
 - Mr. Anthony Tyrrell
 - Hon. Diane Elan Wick
- 2) Justice Kremer adjourned the meeting at 9:45 a.m.